DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 398 745 FL 024 047

AUTHOR He, Agnes Weiyun
TITLE Constructing Facts and Stances through Voicing: Cases from Student-Counselor Interaction.
PUB DATE 94
NOTE 18p.; In: Pragmatics and Language Learning. Monograph Series, Volume 5, p147-62, 1994; see FL 014 038.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Counselor Client Relationship; *Counselor Role; Help Seeking; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Communication; *Language Patterns; Language Research; Linguistic Theory; Power Structure; *Pragmatics; Problem Solving; Student Behavior
IDENTIFIERS *Voicing

ABSTRACT

Drawing data from academic counseling encounters in one university, a study examined the practice of invoking others' voices as displays of how the participants have come to know about some particular information, and of their stances toward what they report. The study focused on voicing and its associated linguistic features in several different topical and sequential contexts: presenting problems, solving problems, seeking a second opinion, and establishing authority and credibility. Data were gathered by recording and analyzing 11 counseling sessions. Results suggest that invoking others' voices enables students to orient the counselor to the problem at hand, impose a strong interactional demand for the counselor to address the problem, and elicit a second assessment from the counselor. While pressing the students for the sources of information about university rules and requirements, the counselors themselves freely appropriate and superimpose the "voice" of the institution. Placements of voicing and the respective modal/temporal choices in the reporting and commentary show that speakers' construction of a past interaction embodies not only a reflection of his/her version of the interaction itself, but also embodies stances consequential for the here and now. Contains 18 references. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lawrence F. Rhodes
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Pragmatics and Language Learning
Monograph Series, Volume 5, 1994

ED 398 745

CONSTRUCTING FACTS AND STANCES THROUGH VOICING: CASES FROM STUDENT-COUNSELOR INTERACTION

Agnes Weiyun He

Drawing data from academic counseling encounters, this paper examines the practice of invoking others' voices as displays of how the participants have come to know about some particular information and of their stances toward what they report. It focuses on voicing and its associated linguistic features in several different topical and sequential contexts: presenting problems, solving problems, seeking a second opinion and establishing authority and credibility.

This study shows that invoking others' voices enables the student to orient the counselor to the problem at hand, to impose a strong interactional demand for the counselor to address the problem, and to elicit a second assessment from the counselor. While pressing the students for the sources of information regarding university rules and requirements, the counselors themselves freely appropriate and superimpose the voice of the university institution. The placements of voicing and the respective modal/temporal choices in the reporting and the commentary show that a speaker's construction of a past interaction embodies not only a reflection of his/her version of the interaction itself but also embodies stances consequential for the here and now.

INTRODUCTION

The notion of *voicing* has been examined in research on participant frameworks, performance and reported speech in association with the definition of speakers, authors, agents and social actors. According to Bakhtin (1981, 1986), words are not semantically stable units with fixed meanings but rather accumulate the heterogeneous overtones of the situations in which they are used and of the conflicting ideological horizons out of which they arise. His approach calls into question the traditional notion that a piece of discourse orients to a single coherent viewpoint. A similar argument but from a sociological, interactional point of view is made by Goffman (1981) who points out that a piece of discourse, even when physically produced by one single speaker, may fail to take the form of a unitary construction, as a consequence of the multiple motivations and identities projected in interaction. Recent critical approaches (e.g., Berman, 1988) also undermine the notion of a unitary speaking ego as the source of discourse,

FL 024 014

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

thus focusing our attention on voice in relation to authorship and interpretation and interposing a plurality of discourse sources.

At the same time, discourse analysts have demonstrated that the traditional grammatical dichotomy between direct and indirect speech, a prototypical way in which dialogical oppositions are created through embedding one person's speech in that of another, has limitations in accounting for the everyday social interaction of reporting what was said with the associated formal markers and prescriptions for appropriate usage. As a number of scholars have observed, the reporting of what was said in a direct speech form is more likely a construction of the reporter than a verbatim record of the actual speech. This phenomenon has been investigated in terms of, among others, pseudoquotation (Dubois, 1989), indirection (Brody, 1991), constructed dialogue (Tannen, 1986, 1989), zero quotatives (Mathis & Yule, 1992), and dialogues of genres (Bauman, 1992).

Taking the above literature as a point of departure, I examine in this paper the practice of invoking others' speech in a particular institutional setting, namely, the academic counseling encounters in an American university, where the academic counselors and their student clients devote a considerable part of their interaction to establishing facts concerning academic problems for which advice becomes necessary and/or facts concerning university rules and requirements which the students should know in order to make their own decisions. In constructing these facts, both the students and the counselors often invoke a third, absent party's or sometimes each other's speech. This paper thus aims to answer the following questions: (1) How is the invocation of others' voices occasioned in such settings? (2) How does the invocation of others' voices contribute to establishing facts and speakers' stances?

Below, after a brief description of the ethnographic background and methodology, I will perform analyses of my data.

ETHNOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND

The data examined in this study are a subset of a database for a larger study (He, 1993), which were collected in a large American university, to which I gave a fictitious name "Central University," abbreviated as "CU." The goals of the counseling services in this university are twofold: to impart information regarding university rules, regulations and requirements and to provide advice on scholarly matters. Specifically, the duties of the counselors include assistance with students' program planning, assessment of students' degree requirements, help in choosing a major, counseling regarding academic difficulties, assistance with requests for exception to regulations, and pre-health, pre-law, pre-graduate school counseling.

In addition to full-time, professional counselors, there are academic counseling assistants who are graduate students in various academic disciplines within the College of Letters and Science, hired half time (20 hours per week). Erickson & Shultz (1982) characterize the school counselor as an "institutional gatekeeper" for he/she has the authority to make decisions about the social mobility of the student and tends the gates and channels of mobility not only within the school but within the larger society as well. In my academic counseling context, however, the counselors are not empowered to make decisions on an individual student's progress within the university. They are expected to elicit student goals, to ensure correct information, to not

make decisions for the student and thus to conduct the encounter so as to turn all decisions over to the student.

To arrange for a counseling meeting, the student usually takes the initiative by making an appointment. An appointment slip is filled out which indicates the purpose of the visit, the student's name, student identification number, status (e.g., freshman, sophomore), and major. The counselor / counseling assistant is given the appointment slip before he/she meets with the student. Counseling meetings are one-to-one between a student and a counselor or a counseling assistant. All appointments are scheduled for half-hour intervals. Counseling meetings are held in the academic counseling office, which is a large office divided into small cubicles of counseling assistants' and small offices of counselors'.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYTICAL METHODS

Procedures

Three full-time academic counselors, five half-time counseling assistants (hereafter "counselors" except when it is analytically consequential to differentiate them from full-time counselors), and twenty-one undergraduate students participated in the study. Among the counselors, there were three women and five men. Of the twenty-one students, three were male and eighteen were female. The names of the students, counselors, counseling assistants, and those mentioned by the students, counselors, or counseling assistants during the encounter have all been replaced with fictitious ones which retain the same gender and, wherever possible, the same number of syllables.

A total of twenty-one (ranging from 10 to 30 minutes) counseling sessions were video and audio recorded during the period from October 1990 to August 1991. Among these, eleven were transcribed according to conventions developed by Gail Jefferson (Sacks et al., 1974, 731-733; also Atkinson & Heritage, 1984, ix-xvi). These eleven sessions were selected because: (1) they are more audible than others; (2) they cover all counselors and counseling assistants who participated; and (3) they represent a variety of subject matters being discussed in the counseling encounters. These data were first transcribed from the audio and then checked with the video recording. The transcription symbols used in this study can be found in Appendix A.

Analytical methods

For the purposes of this study, I resort to mainly (1) Conversation Analysis (CA) which has provided the methodological apparatus specifically for research on naturally occurring, conversational phenomena and (2) Functional Systemic Linguistics which with its focus on contexts and choices complements the traditional CA analysis (e.g., turn-taking, sequence organization, story construction, repair organization, openings and closings) with more sensitivity and systematicity to grammatical details (e.g., modal choices, tense/aspect markers, projections of ideas and locutions) (for a detailed discussion of these two analytical approaches, see He, 1993: Chapter 2).

Of particular relevance to the following analysis of the practice of voicing is the grammatical description of modality in English by Halliday (1985: Chapter 4) who theorizes that the speaker's judgement of the probabilities or obligations in what he/she says can be traced in the modal forms of the language he/she uses. Halliday (1985: Chapter 3) extends the use of the term modality from auxiliary modal verbs (e.g., "may" or "might) to include lexical elements which have that function (e.g., "probably," "of course," "always," "to my mind," "broadly speaking," etc.). He then divides modality into different values (Halliday, 1985, p. 75) along the parameters of probability (possible -> probable -> certain), frequency (sometimes -> usually -> always), obligation (allowed -> supposed -> required), or inclination (willing -> anxious -> determined), with arrows pointing from low to high modal values.

Building upon Halliday's analysis of modality, I focused on the following modal elements (for a detailed specification, see He, in press, a) in the analysis of the invoking of others' speech.

low modality	can, could, may, might, would, don't have to, I don't know, I'm wondering, not sure, likely, possible, I think, I thought, I don't think, probably, maybe, perhaps
high modality	must, will, should, ought to, have to, had to, has to, need, I'm sure, exactly, certainly, really, definitely, absolutely, of course, supposed to, always, never

In what follows, I examine the practice of voicing and its associated linguistic features in several different topical and sequential contexts: presenting problems, solving problems, seeking a second opinion and establishing authority and credibility.

DATA ANALYSIS

Problem presentation

In a separate paper (He, in press, b), I examined the narrative accounts students offer at the beginning of the academic counseling encounter and how they help construct the students' occasion-specific identities. One of the features of these accounts is that they are often interwoven with reported speech. In this connection, the speaker is not constructing a situation in which two characters are involved in a dialogue; rather, it appears that the speaker is projecting his/her attitude or that of the reportee. Such report is often (1) self-initiated and (2) in the form of indirect quotation.

For example, in the following segment, Helen, another counselor is invoked by the student in her trouble telling; believing Helen or not believing her becomes a central thread to tie together the student's narrative which eventually leads to advice giving (line 29ff). In other words, what is attributed to Helen constitutes the problem which gives rise to the student's stance of uncertainty which in turn invites the counselor's advice-giving:

Extract (1)
Neil2: problem telling through other's voice

((The following occurs at the beginning of the encounter. N and S have just established that S is a pre-math major.))

016 S: =B't um (.2) see (.) um I: *would* like to go to (.)
017 med school,
018 N: Uhuh,
019->S: Ok, (.8) anda when I (.2) when I was in the
020 orientation, (.) Helen told me that (.2) it's a
021 LOT better if I am a MAth major, (.) cu:s er
022 medical schools they prefer math major people.
023 (.4) And I am *not sure* how that I mean I I
024 believed her THEN b't NOW I've been talking to
025 people
026 N: NOW you DOn't believe her.
027 S: Yeah I am *NOT sure* if that is the (.2) the RIght
028 thing or no:t.
029 N: I *wud* say um (.) I'm not as much of an expert (.)
030 about what happens to math majors (.) as Helen is.
031 Helen's (.2) doing research with what WHAT (.) ha>
032 happened to CU math majors and where they GO.
033 (.3)

Here the student reports that Helen has stated that medical schools accept a higher percentage of math majors. In the report, the student carefully retains her own attitude separate from Helen's. Although the view that medical schools accept more math majors than applicants from other majors is attributed to Helen, the student also conveys her own attitude toward this view. Note that in line 21, the student stressed "lot" (in "a LOT better") and "math" (in "if I'm a MAth major"). Subsequently in line 24, she raised her volume and pitch to the same level when she speaks of "THEN" and "NOW." Hence, the student is presenting a contrast: a strong view of some sort and an equally strong doubt concerning that view.

The separation of the reported speech by Helen and the student's own commentary is made even more salient by the distinct temporal and modal choices. What Helen reportedly said is encoded with temporal markers only (lines 19-22); whereas the student's commentary is encoded with low value modal elements ("not sure" in lines 23 and 27) which help construct a sense of doubt and uncertainty in contrast to the certainty and truthfulness of Helen's speech. Thus the student portrays the account of the problem as certain and truthful and her own attitude as doubtful and uncertain.

Similarly, in the next encounter, the student invokes her degree auditor in explaining the reason for her visit.

Extract (2)
Cecilia1: problem telling: cross speaker similarity

((C and S have just sat down. C is reading S's appointment slip which states the reason for the visit.))

007 C: .hhh Ok, referred by degree (.2) auditor.
008 (.5)
009 S: Yeah-
010 C: There *must* be a story here,
011 (.2) ((S reads Informed Consent Form))
012 S: °What is the date? The twenty:°=
013 C: =Second.
014 (1.) ((S dates Informed Consent Form))
015 S: Ye:ah well (.2) my degree audit (.) is (.4) ok
016-> with the uh degree auditor but she said that the
017 records at L&S (.3) aren't (.2) up to DATE. So I
018 have brought her copies of the paper work,
019 C: HUN.
020 S: So (.) but (.) my deGREE is ok, bu::t (.3) you
021 know I *need* to fix it up here.
022 (.3)

It is not the case that the student herself has any difficulties or problems with making decisions but that the student is here to take care of problems that may have arisen in the bureaucratic process. The problem that prompted the student's visit is cast directly in the reported speech attributed to the degree auditor. To look closely at the student's language, she embeds the problem (that her records are not up to date) in her report of the degree auditor's speech (line 16ff). Like the student in the previous data extract, the student here reports what her degree auditor says with temporal choices (lines 16-17), with no display of uncertainty of its truth value. Turning on the degree auditor's voice helps the student to project an entirely objective stance toward the issue and warrants her request (line 21), which is framed with a high value modal "need" indicating obligatoriness.

In both cases above, students cast their problems by reporting what another source of institutional authority has told them, thereby attributing the responsibility of the problems to not themselves but those whose speech they are reporting. These reportings are anticipatory in nature in the sense that students provide justifications before the problematic request is identified and before any advisor fault-finding or altercation has occurred.

Problem solution

The practice of invocation of others' voices can also be found in the process of searching for a solution to a presented problem. In this context, students often recast what they understand their counselors to be saying, explicitly or otherwise, in their own words. This happens especially when the students pursue a definite reply from the counselor, as in the next extract.

Extract (3)
Tim1: problem solution: student voices counselor's thoughts

((Student and counselor are discussing courses to take in the next quarter.))

423 (.5)
424 S: Now, these four choices (.) what *would* you say
425 (.) be my first choice?
426 (.3)
427 T: History: (.2) eight C,

((In lines 428-554, T clarified with S what the four courses S is referring to in line 424 and discusses the work load involved in each of the four choices.))

555 (.5)
556 S: Yeah (.2) the psych ten has some limits on it.
557 T: Right.
558->S: So you think *maybe* I *should* have history first.
559 T: Uh::: well (.) yes and no I mean: like you said
560 uh: there's gonna be: (.) you know th' the book
561 that (.) uh:: (.2) *will* be the reading (.) an:d
562 (.2) and ther' since it is something for your
563 major.
564 (.)

((In lines 565-579, T discusses the fact that many students newly transferred from another school are not used to the CU system.))

580 (.)
581 T: But if you have any: (.) concerns about that at
582 all then (.) you know uh: you *may* want to hold up
583 on that until you're a little bit more adjusted
584 so that=
585 S: =Ok, that's interesting
586 T: You know
587->S: So w- these ha- that has the least reading (.2)
588 like (.) this *will* be the amount of reading in
589 work load.
590->T: Right
591->S: Ok.
592 ((paper shuffling))
593 S: Ok, (.) that's basically what I wanted to ask you
594 T: Ok,
595 (.)

Within the topic of choosing courses for the next quarter, the student requests expert opinion (424-425). The counselor and the student together clarify which four choices to choose from (427-555). Yet the clarification does not result in any clear indication of the counselor's preference for any particular course. Until line 555, the student's initial question in 424-425 has not been answered. The student thus pursues the counselor's opinion again in line 558, voicing the counselor's thoughts ("so you think maybe I should have history first"). After the counselor gives an equivocal, noncommittal response ("Uh," "well," "yes and no," and "I mean," line 559ff), the student rephrases his question (line 587) in the form of statement in need of confirmation (change from "what should be the first choice" to "whether a particular course has the least reading"). The counselor reassures the student (line 590). And finally the student acknowledges receipt of confirmation of information (line 591).

It is worth noting that the student shifts his stance from being tentative to being certain in the two times he voices the counselor's opinion. In line 558 the student projects tentativeness through the use of the low value modal "maybe." When he makes another attempt in lines 587-588, he projects a sense of certainty through the use of a superlative degree ("the least reading" in line 587) and a high value modal element "will" (line 588). Consequently, counselor's stance shifts from noncommittal (line 559 "yes and no") to committal (line 590 "right") accordingly.

Here we see that explicitly asking a counselor for advice is not as simple a matter as we might initially think. In this instance, the question in line 424-425 is transformed into a recasting of the voice of the hearer (line 558) and further into a statement in need of confirmation (lines 587-589). These transformations provide further evidence for the negotiated nature of the counseling encounter. The ways in which the student requests advice is shaped by and shapes the extent to which the counselor is committed to what the student takes to be advice.

On other occasions, counselors and students jointly invoke a third party's voice, thereby co-constructing a solution to a problem. In what follows, the student again voices what "Helen said" regarding a petition to have a transfer class accepted for credit and the counselor collaborates in the report:

Extract (4)
Neil2: problem solution: counselor and student merge voices

((N and S are working through the possibilities in choice of major based on what is required of each major and what requirements S is yet to satisfy. S is a transfer student.))

225 (.2)
226 N: Umm (.2) so you *need* the:se you nee-(.) I guess
227 you *need* PIC10A (.) right? you haven't ( )=
228 S: =Oh NO.
229 (.2)
230 S: No. Uh I'm going to (.2) well I have a Fortran,
231 N: Uhuh,
232->S: That Helen said we *can* jus=

233->N: =*shud shud should* accept that=
234 S: =Right.
235 N: Ok. So. Fine.

The problem in this instance concerns the student's credit for a course PIC[programming in computing]10A, a problem raised by the counselor in lines 226-227. The student first acknowledges the problem ("no" in lines 228 and 230), then goes some way to address the problem ("Uh I'm going to" in line 230) but soon abandons it and moves on to explain what course she has taken ("a Fortran"). Seeing that the counselor displays no explicit response except for a minimal receipt token "uhuh" in line 231, the student in line 232 adds a post modifier which voices Helen's judgment of the Fortran course. The counselor displays his alignment with the student through his understanding of what the student reports Helen said. He does so through a replacement (of "can" with "should") and also an upgrade (from low value "can" to high value "should" indicating stronger agreement) and a collaborative completion of the student's turn (line 233). Further, the latching of the counselor's turn onto the student's (line 232-233) and subsequently the student's onto the counselor's (line 233-234) highlight their strong convergence behavior.

This convergence of both linguistic usage and the participants' stances constructs a shared judgement of the speech of the party being invoked and a shared orientation toward the task of problem solution.

Seeking a second assessment

In this section, I focus on cases in which students report advice from another counselor in a sequential context such that the current counselor is interactionally obligated to offer a second opinion. Analytically, seeking a second opinion through reporting advice by others is different from presenting problems through others' voices in that (1) the reported speech itself doesn't constitute the "problem;" rather, it is a candidate solution offered by a third party; and (2) in real time, it does not occur in the beginning of the interaction, but much later in the interaction. Below, I discuss two extracts, each illustrating a different sequential environment. The first one concerns a student's implicit request for verification by the counselor of what he was told by another counselor:

Extract (5)
Tim1: implicit request for second assessment

((S, a chemistry major, now faces having to change to another major as he hasn't completed the pre-major requirements in time. Beth is another counselor.))

199 S: Before I forget (.) I got admin- a letter from
200 the admissions because I don't have the one year
201 general chem they said I *have to* change my major
202-> from chemistry. .hhh So I talked to Beth and
203 she said just change to anything (.) like math

204 whatever
205 T: Uhun,
206 S: An::d I changed to math and she said as far as
207 the credit limit goes uh the department (.2)
208 cybernetics has the final say and .hhh as long as
209-> we see you don't want to stay here forever you*'ll*
210 be fine. You *can* you know you *shouldn*'t be
211 concerned with that.
212 T: Uhun,
213 (.2)
214 T: Yeah:: the thing is you- you're gonna you're
215 gonna double major right? Chem cybernetics?
216 (.4)
217 T: Is that what you're-
218 S: No I *can*'t stay in chemistry
219 T: Ok uh I'm s- so jus=
220->S: =Cybernetics. She also sa- tzs she also
221 mentioned that becau:se (.) cybernetics is such
222 a small department they *cou:ld* (.2) they *could*
223 allow students to take more course than the major
224 requires.
225 T: Right. U::n ((clearing throat)) see (.2) as far
226 as that goes (.) what happens is (.2) uh she's
227 half way correct.

In this case the student reports the speech of another counselor, Beth, as a way of seeking confirmation of what he has been told by another counselor. From line 203 onwards, the student appropriates Beth's voice directly (note the use of pronouns "you" and "we" in lines 209 and 210). This direct appropriation is in response to the letter from the admissions office mentioned in line 199. If the letter poses a problem, then what Beth says would be a solution. Hence there would be no "problems" and the purpose of the student's report would be cast in doubt from an outsider's point of view.

The counselor, who is trained to look for problems, however, takes it upon himself to make sense of what has been reported. When he receives no response (line 213) from the student after a minimal acknowledgement token (line 212), the counselor solicits more information (lines 214-224), and finally gives his evaluation of the reported speech that the student attributes to Beth ("what she says is half way correct").

Perhaps not accidentally, the student's recast of what Beth said contains modality markers of different values at two different places. High value modal elements "will" (line 209) and "should" (line 210, in self-repair of "you can") are used in his initial report of Beth's speech. Low value modal "could" (line 222) is used later in his additional report. The discrepancy between the certainty projected in the initial report and the tentativeness projected in the additional report helps invite the counselor's second assessment of what Beth said.

On other occasions students after reporting a third party's speech explicitly state the re-

quest for a second opinion, as we see in the next extract.

Extract (6)
Joyce1: explicit request for second assessment

((S and J disagree on the residence requirement S should be held for))

045 ((pause))
046 **J**: Ok, the resi- the u:m .hhh residence requi:rement
047 is that sixty-eight of your last eight units,
048 (.5)
049 **S**: Uhun,
050 **J**: *Have to* be taken at (.) CU.
051 **S**: *I thought* it was thirty-six of your last forty-
052 eight.
053 **J**: U::m I'm *not sure* whether you'*ll* be held towards
054 (.2) when you came in or the ones right now this
055 is currently the requirement.
056->**S**: Uh: ok, oh: becus it was uh is it Dr. (.3)
057 Stein? I mean-
058 **J**: Rick Stein?
059->**S**: Rick Stein? °I don't remember° Um (.) he
060 told me (.) u::h (.) thirty-six out of (.) the
061 last forty-eight but I wanna make sure .hhh and *I*
062 *think MAYbe* you- that's becaus:: I go by:: what
063 the rules were
064 **J**: Then?
065 **S**: Then.
066 **J**: Ok, thirty-six out of the last how many?=
067 **S**: Forty-eight.
068 **J**: Forty-eight.
069->**S**: That's what I *need*ed to find out.
070 **J**: Ok, I'*ll* check on that for you. I'*ll* talk to
071 Rick.
072 (.2)

What is interesting in this instance is that the student does not bring up Dr. Stein when she first displays disagreement with the counselor in line 51 ("I thought"). It is only after the counselor displays further doubts and uncertainties ("I'm not sure," line 53) that the student invokes Dr. Stein. It is worth noticing that having cited Dr. Stein with temporal markers only (lines 59-61), which indicate no equivocation, the student then expresses uncertainty in attempting to explain what she just cited ("I think" and "maybe" in lines 61-62). The implication appears to be that it is not the student who disagrees with the counselor, but another counselor, Dr. Stein, who does. Hence the student is challenging counselor A (Joyce) with words from

counselor B (Dr. Stein) and this has effective interactional consequences: the counselor in lines 70-71 promises to double check with Dr. Stein, a strong obligation as indicated through the high value modal "will" (line 70).

Authority, credibility and voice

So far I have examined some of the ways in which the students invoke some other counselor or other sources of authority. Overall, students use reported speech more frequently than counselors do. Counselors also report other sources. The sources they quote from include (1) the official catalog, a reference many counselors use during the counseling encounter, and (2) authority at a higher level in the institution. In cases when the counselors do borrow others' "voices," they often freely speak for the university institution and do so without mentioning specific sources or even without designing their talk as reported speech in its traditionally prescribed form. For example, in all encounters under examination, the counselors often shift their use of first person pronouns between "I" and "we," depending on what is being said, a phenomenon which warrants special treatment but which is not dealt with on this occasion. What I would like to point out is another phenomenon which resembles what is analyzed by Mathis & Yule (1992), whereby direct speech is reported with neither a reporting verb nor an attributed speaker, a phenomenon which they call "zero quotatives." They indicate that in the paradigm case of zero quotative use, the real speaker can only be inferred through situational and sequential context; the direct speech forms are presented not as reports or pseudo-reports of what was said, but as indications of speaker stance.

The following extract serves as a case in point.

Extract (7)
Neil2: projecting authority through displaying intimate knowledge

((S has just asked N if math majors stand a better chance of being accepted by medical school.))

033 (.3)
034 N: Uh b't I *wud* say that *certainly* (.) medical school
035 doesn't CAre whatjur major IS.
036 (.8)
037 N: Y=
038 S: =Yeah that's what I heard.
039->N: What they do care is (.2) er did you take the
040 appropriate classes, Do you have the: (.) the
041 grades for appropriate classes, Do you have the
042 overall GPA do you have letters of recommendation
043 and so on so on so on.
044 (.5)

Here, we do not see the commonly prescribed features of reported speech such as a re-

porting verb (e.g., "say," "tell," or "remark"), synchronizing of verb tense, and attribution of the speaker; instead, we have a syntactic structure with a subordinate clause which functions as the object of the verb "care" (line 39) and within which some direct quotes are inserted ("did you take...letters of recommendation" lines 39-42). The distance between the counselor and medical school is diminished by not using any reporting verbs. Further, by embedding the reported speech in his own speech (via use of a wh-cleft construction and attaching "and so on so on so on" at the end of the clause), the counselor also superimposes his voice onto that of the medical school. This syntactic embedding as well as the high value modal choice "certainly" (line 34) allows the counselor to stress the wide range of intimate knowledge he has with regard to the position of medical schools. Finally, all of this is framed by "I would say" (line 34); hence the counselor is intertwining his own voice with that of the university.

Thus we have seen that counselors "freely" appropriate the voice of the university institution and other authorities, adopting and adapting the official institutional voice. The student never questions the "practical epistemology" (Whalen & Zimmerman, 1990, p. 465) of how a counselor has come to know about some particular information regarding university rules and requirements. On the contrary, in cases where the student fails to attribute sources for certain kinds of information which he/she asserts with certainty, the counselor usually presses for an attribution. This I illustrate with the next two extracts.

Extract (8)
Neil2: credible voice: information regarding course requirements

((S and N are discussing which of the pre-med requirements S has completed and which chemistry classes S is yet to complete.))

259 (.2)
260 **S**: So I *have to* take (.) 11C (.) 11B 11C and 11CL.
261->**N**: Ok, so who is this information (from) who told you
262 this?
263 **S**: Chemistry department,
264 **N**: Ok, great.
265 (.)
266 **N**: That sounds- then then believe it.
267 **S**: ((laughter))

In line 260, the student asserts that he is required to take certain courses (high value modal "have to" suggests certainty and obligation). This piece of information concerns the university requirements, an area in which the counselor is supposed to have expertise but which the student is now asserting without displaying how he has come to know about it. The counselor's uptake in this instance is that he first aligns himself with the student ("ok" in line 261) and subsequently challenges this piece of information that is unattributed ("Who told you this?" in line 261), a practice never reciprocated by the student. Hearing that the answer concerning the chemistry classes comes from the Chemistry Department, which is symbolic of institutional authority, the counselor acknowledges this information as having validity ("then

believe it" in line 266).

Not only do counselors press for students' sources of information when students do not display them, they also pursue specific sources when students report second-hand information which the counselors do not agree with. In the next extract, the counselor finds something in the file concerning which she does not agree with the degree auditor. At this point the student says:

Extract (9)
Cecilia1: credible voice: administrative / procedural information

((S is a graduating senior. Earlier in the interaction, she has told C that her degree auditor had told her paper work at L&S was not up-to-date. "She" in line 53 and after refers to the degree auditor; "that" refers to Women's History.))

053->S: Because apparently she said THAT wasn't in the
054 computer.
055 (.5)
056 S: So uh=
057->C: =who who is this?
058 S: Uh:: Michelle Bateman,
059 ((paper shuffling))
060 C: Goodness grief.
061 ((paper shuffling))
062->S: Hhhhh she said that (.) I had four (.) I *needed*
063 four (.) for my historical analysis still.
064 C: Four units.
065 S: Yeah.
066 (.3)
067 S: And that *should* be the Women's History and I
068 guess she (.2) just (.) completed this.
069 C: Interesting.
070 S: Yeah.
071 (.2)

In lines 53 and 62, the student keeps quoting the degree auditor as both the basis and the means of her arguments. In line 57, we see a similar phenomenon as examined in the last extract: the counselor presses for attribution of information. (The student, however, never asks the counselor where she gets her information from.) Here, the categorical identity of a degree auditor is not enough; the counselor presses for her individual identity. The reason why the counselor does such probing becomes clear in the subsequent talk: it is quite clear that here the "expert" voices don't agree with each other; in lines 60 and 69, the counselor remarks "Goodness grief" and "interesting" in response to what the student tells her that the degree auditor has said.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This paper has concerned itself with the practice of voicing as an interactional accomplishment of displays of how counselors and students have come to know about some particular information and of displays of their stance toward what they report. It has focused on the topical and sequential contexts of these instances and the accompanying linguistic choices. The term "reported speech" has been used in a broad sense to describe a range of discourse practices, all of which report speech by others in one way or another. To answer the questions raised at the beginning of this paper, the invocation of others' voices is practiced in problem-presentation contexts (Extracts (1) & (2)) in which students invoke some authority figure of the university institution to orient the counselor to the problem that concerns them and to distance themselves from the responsibilities of the problems. In cases where they quote or paraphrase the counselor himself, they impose an interactionally even stronger demand for the counselor to address the solution to the problem (Extract (3)). Reporting what another counselor said also gives the student an opportunity to elicit a second assessment from the counselor while avoiding the problem of directly confronting one counselor's words with those of another (Extracts (5) & (6)).

While in most cases students volunteer the reporting they do, in some instances attribution is elicited by the counselor with respect to the credibility of information regarding university rules and requirements (Extracts (8) & (9)). Whereas the counselors press the students for the sources of their information and opinions, they themselves freely appropriate the voice of the university institution (Extract (7)) with no challenge from the students. The fact that it is the student, not the counselor, who is interactionally driven to turn to authoritative voices can inform us about the issues specific to institutional identities in the counseling encounter. The student is treated by the counselor as lacking in credibility (in terms of reliability of information); the counselor speaks through the voice of the institution and thus he/she is seen to embody the official version of information regarding university policies and requirements.

Crucial to the construction of facts and information is the construction of speakers' stances toward what they know, a process in which speakers' modal and temporal choices play an important role. We have seen that, through making different modal and temporal choices in invoking others' voices and in making their own commentaries respectively, students are able to assign certain stances to the reportees and to project their own stances as being different (Extracts (1), (5) and (6)), a divergence which makes it interactionally imperative for the counselors to address the problem at hand. In other instances, students align themselves with the stance of the reportee (Extract (2)) to make a stronger case for their request and to solicit the counselor's agreement (Extract (4)). In other words, through casting the reportee's particular stance, the student also casts his/her own stance.

Returning to the Bakhtinian (1986) perspective, texts are constituted by and embedded in dialogues. What has been discussed in this paper with regard to the placements of invoking others' voices and the respective modal/temporal choices in the reporting and the commentary shows that a speaker's construction of a past interaction embodies not only a reflection of his/her version of the interaction itself but also embodies stances consequential for the here and now.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper is based on Chapter 7 of my dissertation (He, 1993). I thank Marianne Celce-Murcia, Manny Schegloff and Elinor Ochs for helpful comments. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 7th Annual International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, April 2-3, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.

THE AUTHOR

Agnes Weiyun He received her PhD in Applied Linguistics from UCLA in 1993. She has published her research on spoken and written discourse in journals including *Language in Society*, *TEXT*, *WORD*, and *Issues in Applied Linguistics*. Currently she is preparing a book manuscript which combines her interests in functional linguistics, conversation analysis, ethnography, and institutional discourse.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, J. & Heritage, J., (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Transl.); M. Holquist (Ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. V. W. McGee (Transl.); C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Eds.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bauman, R. (1992). Contextualization, tradition, and the dialogue of genres. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context* (pp. 125-145). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Berman, A. (1988). *From the new criticism to deconstructionism: The reception of structuralism and post-structuralism*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Brody, J. (1991). Indirection in the negotiation of self in everyday Tojolab'al women's conversation. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 1, 78-96.

Dubois, B. L. (1989). Pseudoquotation in current English communication: "Hey, she didn't really say it", *Language in Society* 18, 343-359.

Erickson, F. & Shultz, J. (1982). *The counselor as gatekeeper: Social interaction in interviews*. New York: Academic Press.

Goffman, E. (1976). Replies and responses. *Language in Society 5*, 257-313. (Reprinted in Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk* (pp. 5-77). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.)

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

He, W. (1993). *Reconstructing institutions through talk: a discourse study of academic counseling encounters*. Ph.D. dissertation, Applied Linguistics, UCLA.

He, A. W. (in press, a). Exploring modality in institutional interactions: cases from academic counseling encounters. To appear in *TEXT, 13*(4), 503-528.

He, A. W. (in press, b). Constructing discourse identities in the openings of academic counseling encounters. To appear in H. B. Mokros (Ed.), *Interaction and identity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Mathis, T. & Yule, G. (1992, Febuary). Zero quotatives in contemporary English. Paper presented at the 17th Annual Meeting of AAAL, Seattle.

Sacks, H, Schegloff, E. A. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50, 696-735.

Tannen, D. (1986). Introducing constructed dialogue in Greek and American conversational and literary narrative. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Direct and indirect speech* (pp. 311-332). Berlin: Mouton.

Tannen, D. (1989). Talking voices. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whalen, M. & Zimmerman, D. (1990). Describing trouble: practical epistemology in citizen calls to the police. *Language in Society* 19, 465-492.

APPENDIX A: Transcription Symbols

CAPS	emphasis, signalled by pitch or volume
.	falling intonation
,	falling-rising intonation
°	quiet speech
[ ]	overlapped talk
-	cut-off
=	latched talk
:	prolonged sound or syllable
(0.0)	silences in seconds and tenths of seconds
(.)	short, untimed pauses of one tenth of a second or less
( )	undecipherable or doubtful hearing
->	turn(s) focused for analysis
(( ))	additional observation
S:	at the beginning of a stretch of talk, identifies the speaker; in the following data S is for student, other letters are for counselor
ital	modal elements
> <	rapid speech
< >	slow speech
Joe1	extract is from the encounter between the counselor "Joe" and his first student